

K 2 D

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE
SECURITY COMMITTEE
COMPUTER SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE

5 Nov. 1983
DCISEC-CSS-M158

1. The One Hundred and Fifty-Eighth meeting of the Computer Security Subcommittee was held on 18 October 1983 at the [redacted] and was attended by the following persons:

[redacted] Chairman
[redacted] Executive Secretary
[redacted] CIA
[redacted] CIA
[redacted] NSA
Mr. Ralph Neeper, Army
Mr. Carl Martz, Navy
Ms. Sue Berg, Navy
Mr. Robert Graytock, Dept. of Justice
Mr. Gene Epperly, OSD
[redacted] SECOM Staff
[redacted] SECOM staff
[redacted] CIA (observer)

2. [redacted] provided a summary of the SECOM Seminar held in [redacted] during the week of 10 October 1983.

Considerable time was spent discussing computer security, with the discussions primarily focused on the activities initiated by [redacted] under her contract.

The safeguards for critical systems effort was also a topic of discussion at the seminar. The point of this activity is to engineer and apply, to "critical systems", a set of fixes. Each Intelligence Community agency was requested to nominate a set of its critical systems. A determination will be made as to whether any of the systems have deficiencies and, if so, what the retrofit costs will be. The list of "critical systems" is presently before the Deputy DCI, Mr. McMahon.

The SECOM received a briefing, as requested by [redacted] on required computer security R&D. This submission was intended to reflect R&D which is desired, but currently unfunded. [redacted] noted that the DoD planning and budgeting for computer security, via the Consolidated Computer Security Program (CCSP), had been very thorough. Since the R&D submission to the SECOM was intended to reflect desired but unfunded programs, the submission was not extensive. It was later noted that there is no intelligence analysis activity funded as a community activity. This will be presented to [redacted] as a proposed fy 85 item. [redacted] will be added to the R&D program to support the production of threat data.

Also discussed were the individual subcommittee budgets, the point

STAT STAT STAT STAT STAT

being made to the SECOM that these funds represented critical seed money which is used to initiate programs which might otherwise never see the light of day. It was noted during the discussions that several programs which have benefitted from such seed money have subsequently been picked up, supported, and augmented by the sponsoring Department or Agency (e.g., the IR review program being run by the Navy member).

3. As a result of the above discussions, [] reviewed the currently proposed DoD R&D program. Enclosure 1 shows those R&D programs (CCSP + individual Agencies) already funded. She pointed out that no money was being requested for these programs, but that support for them was needed during the budget cycle. Enclosure 2 shows the those programs which are currently unfunded, and thus could be supported with funds. She also pointed out that DoD had proposed [] over guidance, which is being strongly supported by the SECDEF.

4. The Navy member reported on the IR review project, indicating that the [] of Navy fy 83 funds that were being sought were lost. He is currently requesting [] of fy 84 funds from both the Navy and the SECOM. He reported that he was also offered support and funding from the NSA COMSEC organization.

5. [] of the SECOM staff, distributed a new proposal for the rewrite of DCID 1/16. The paper represents the policy section, and will ultimately be accompanied by a regulation. [] pointed out that the new document is not organized along the "modes of operation" of the current DCID. Rather, it is structured such that decisions are made based upon where a system falls along each of the three axes of user clearance range, data classification range, and need-to-know range. Since this document had not been previously seen by the Subcommittee, there was little discussion of the contents. The membership was asked to have reviewed it and have comments prepared by the next meeting. [] also claimed that, by direction, all DCID's will be classified SECRET, which is contrary to the Subcommittee's previous guidance.

6. [] announced his retirement from government service; he will be replaced on the Subcommittee by []

7. The next meeting was set for 0930 on November 22 at the Building.

Executive Secretary